



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Ellen
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,852	12/12/2001	David J. Norris	42P11635	9597
8791	7590	02/06/2006	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030				HOANG, THAI D
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2668		

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/017,852	NORRIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thai D. Hoang	2668

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed on 11/18/2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 6-13 and 17-19 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Srinivasan, US Patent Application Publication 2001/0023430 A1, in view of Anderson et al, US Patent No. 5,436,896, hereafter referred to as Srinivasan and Anderson respectively.

Regarding claims 1-2 and 14, Srinivasan discloses a method and system provides for the simultaneous processing of audio and document information during a conference call. The system creates a conference bridge that allows a plurality of participants access to the conferencing over a data network using IP telephony (receiving a request to create an audio bridge session over a packet network between a plurality of call terminals). Srinivasan discloses that an access code is distributed to all participants. At the time that an audio conference is to be held, the participants call into the audio conference bridge. The attendees can establish audio communications through their user interface using IP telephony. The conferencing bridge also includes a connection to the data network and is able to receive and process the IP telephony communications, paragraphs [0005]-[0006] and [0022]. Srinivasan does not explicitly disclose the access number is a bridge number, and the bridge number is a telephone

number. However, Anderson discloses the participants dial a specific telephone number of conference bridge to setup a conference, col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 2 (determining whether an access number associated with said one of said plurality of call terminals is a bridge number; and creating said audio bridge session using said access number; wherein said access number is a telephone number). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply bridge number disclosed by Anderson into Srinivasan's system in order to simplify procedure for accessing to a conference.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, in figure 3, Srinivasan discloses the system comprises the steps of: receiving phone calls from conference participants for access to the conference (receiving a plurality of call requests with said access number). The processor of the system will perform an analysis of the access code (bridge number or PIN), and if the number is invalid access to the meeting will be denied. If the number is valid, access is granted and a further query is made of each attendee (determining whether said access number is a bridge number using a bridge table; establishing a call connection for each call request if said access number is said bridge number). Finally, the system combines all requested access to begin conference (combining each call connection to form said audio bridge session). Fig.3, paragraphs [0022] and [0026].

Regarding claims 4 and 16, since the system disclosed by Srinivasan is a conference system between a leader and participants, therefore, it inherently comprises the steps as recited in claim 4 for transmitting, mixing and receiving IP packet (receiving

a stream of packets representing audio information over each call connection; directing each stream of packets to an intermediate device; and mixing said streams of packets.)

Regarding claim 5, Srinivasan does not explicitly disclose the system operates in accordance with a Transport Control Protocol, Internet Protocol, and H.323 specification. However, TCP/IP and H.323 are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply TCP/IP and H.323 in to Srinivasan's system in order to adapt with conventional system used in the Network.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-13 and 17-19 are allowed for reasons given in the previous office actions.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 14-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the application:

US Patent No. 6,839,416 B1, Shaffer, "Apparatus and method for controlling an audio conference."

US Patent No. 6,850,609 B1, Schrage, "Methods and apparatus for providing speech recording and speech transcription services."


US Patent No. 6,272,214 B1, Jonsson, "Automatic control of participation in telemeetings."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai D. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang



CHI PHAM
PERMISORY PATENT EXAMINER
SEARCHED INDEXED
2/2/02